

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search.

By this amendment, Claims 1-6, 8, and 20-21 have been amended. Claims 10-19 have been cancelled, without prejudice. Claims 22-29 have been added. Hence, Claims 1-9 and 20-29 are pending in the application.

THE REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,807,565 to Dodrill et al. ("Dodrill"). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites in part:

receiving, at an instant messaging environment at a first client, user input that selects the application, wherein said application resides on a node other than said first client;

in response to said user input, configuring an instant messaging control message for the application, including an identifier to locate the application selected at the first client;

sending the instant messaging control message to a second client; and

using the identifier to locate the application and present, in the instant messaging environment of the second client, content that results from executing the located application.

Dodrill may teach that an application is used to generate HTML pages, which may be forwarded on to client nodes for either recording voice messages or for playing back recorded voice messages. Applicants note that the rejection appears to interpret this as teaching the application recited in Claim 1. However, the HTML pages that are sent to the client nodes do

not have an identifier to locate the application and present, in the instant messaging environment of the second client, content that results from executing the located application, as claimed. Thus, Dodrill fails to teach or suggest the recited limitations of, “using the identifier to locate the application and present, in the instant messaging environment of the second client, content that results from executing the located application.”

With respect to the originating client node, Dodrill may teach that in response to a request from a web server, an application server (66) accesses stored XML application pages (68), which define an application. Using the application, the application server generates HTML pages having XML tags and supplies these HTML pages to the requesting web server, such that a voice message may be created at a client node. (col. 5, lines 47-65, col. 7, lines 49-54). However, these HTML pages do not contain an identifier for locating the application, as claimed.

With respect to the receiving client node, Dodrill may teach that the application server executes an application to generate HTML pages having XML tags that specify media content (e.g., .wav files) and control information (col. 6, lines 15-20). With respect to the receiving node, Dodrill also teaches that the application server may generate an HTML page that includes a URL having instructions for obtaining the voice message and a session identifier (col. 8, lines 27-32). However, this HTML page does not contain an identifier for locating the application. Thus, if the application executed by the application server is interpreted as the application selected at the first client, the claim limitations of using the identifier to locate the application and present, in the instant messaging environment of the second client, content that results from executing the located application, is not met. Moreover, Applicants note that the session identifier is not an identifier of the application that created the HTML page.

Applicants further assert that the .WAV file, or the like, which Dodrill teaches may be sent to the receiving client, does not teach the application recited in Claim 1. Applicants note that Claim 1 recites that a selection is received, at an instant messaging environment at a first client, user input that selects the application residing on a node other than said first client. The .WAV file that Dodrill teaches is identified in an HTML page sent to a receiving client is not an application selected at the first client and residing on a node other than said first client. Rather, the .wav file is one that applicants understand to be created, not selected, by the sending client node. Thus, the .wav file in the HTML page cannot be the claimed application selected by user input received at an instant messaging environment at a first client. Thus, if the .wav file sent to the second client node is interpreted as being located by an identifier in a message sent to the second client node, then the limitation of receiving, at an instant messaging environment at a first client, user input that selects the application, wherein said application resides on a node other than said first client, is not met.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by Dodrill.

Currently Amended Claim 8 recites, in part:

receiving a selection of a control feature in an instant messaging environment of a first instant messaging client;

...

using the control feature to present, substantially concurrently in a second instant messaging environment in said second instant messaging client and said first instant messaging environment, results of executing the application

Dodrill fails to teach or suggest these claim limitations. The rejection asserts that Dodrill teaches, in element 56 (the fat clients) displaying results of executing the application to two or more instant messaging users in a simultaneous manner. While the fat clients have

display screens, there is no teaching or suggestion in Dodrill that a control feature whose selection is received in a first instant messaging environment in a first of the fat clients is used to control, substantially concurrently in a second instant messaging environment in said second instant messaging client and said first instant messaging environment, results of executing the application. Therefore, Dodrill fails to teach or suggest the above cited limitations of Claim 8.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 8 is neither taught nor suggested by Dodrill.

Currently Amended Independent Claim 20 comprises similar limitations to those discussed in the response to Claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, Claim 20 is believed to be allowable.

Currently Amended Independent Claim 21 comprises similar limitations to those discussed in the response to Claim 8. For at least the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 8, Claim 21 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 1-7 and 9 depend from either Independent Claim 1 or Independent Claim 8, incorporating limitations therefrom. As explained above, these independent claims include limitations that define patentable subject matter. Therefore, these dependant claims recite patentable subject matter for at least the same reasons their respective independent claims recite patentable subject matter.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 22-29 have been added. Independent Claim 22 comprises similar limitations to those discussed in the response to Claim 8. For at least the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 8, Claim 22 is believed to be allowable. Claims 23-29 depend from Independent Claim 22, incorporating limitations therefrom. Therefore, these dependant claims recite patentable subject matter for at least the same reasons their respective independent claims recite patentable subject matter.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: September 22, 2005

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089
Telephone (408) 414-1080
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076



Ronald M. Pomerenke
Reg. No. 43,009

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment,
Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 9/22/05 by Trudy Bagdon
Trudy Bagdon